

1900. Trees in Street, Park, and Forest. (Read at public meeting, Amesbury, July 21, 1900.) Boston Herald, July 22, 1900.
- 1901b. The Old Oak at Topsfield. Hist. Coll'ns Topsfield Hist. Soc., vol. 7, p. 105-106 (for ill. of tree see vol. 6, p. 67).
- 1902b. Concerning the Plants mentioned in Young's Chronicles. RHODORA, vol. 4, p. 81-82 (April, 1902).
- 1912b. Ropes Memorial Lecture Course. Salem News, Dec. 6, 1912.
- 1912c. First Lecture, Ropes Course. Salem News, Dec. 7, 1912.
- 1912d. Xmas Greens at Peabody Museum. Salem News, Dec. 19, 1912.
- 1913b. Ropes Memorial Garden is being planted with rare flowers, shrubs and plants. Salem News, April 23, 1913.
- 1914b. Ropes Memorial Garden Show. Salem News, May 26, 1914.
1915. Exhibition of Winter Weeds. Salem News, Dec. 22, 1915.
- 1916d. [Winter Blossoming of Hepatica.] Salem News, Feb. 3, 1916.
- 1916e. Notes on the Natural History Collections transferred to the Peabody Museum by the Essex Institute in 1868. Ann. Rept. Essex Inst. for year ending May 1, 1916.
- 1917a. Fungi Drawings at the Museum. Salem News, Jan. 11, 1917.
- 1917b. Fine Collection of Mosses Shown [at Peabody Museum]. Salem News, June 23, 1917.
- 1923c. [Old Trees.] Salem News, Aug. 21, 1923 (Man About Town).
- 1923d. [Disappearance of Trees in Salem listed in "Our Trees."] Salem News, Aug. 1, 1923 (Man About Town).
- 1924c. [Catalpa Trees in Salem.] Salem News, July 22, 1924 (Man About Town).
1926. Plants growing the first season in an uncovered cellar (from mss. prepared in 1908). RHODORA, vol. 28, 1926, p. 69-74.

PEABODY MUSEUM,  
Salem, Massachusetts.

---

PROPAGATION BY SEED IN HYDRANGEA.—Apropos the writer's note on *Hydrangea paniculata*, Sieb. as naturalized in Massachusetts,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Theo. Holm has recently suggested,<sup>2</sup> that propagation by root-shoots (stolons) is more likely than by seed.

When the Lincoln station was first discovered last year, a superficial and unsuccessful search was made for unmistakable seedlings. Early in the following December, some seed was collected from open capsules still persisting on the frost-bitten panicles. Through the courtesy of Mr. Alfred Rehder, a germination test of this seed was made at the Arnold Arboretum. It proved to be normally viable.

<sup>1</sup> RHODORA, xxxi, 18, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, xxxi, 120, 1929.

This autumn, a more thorough search at the Lincoln station yielded several small plants, apparently seedlings, ranging from 1–3 dm. high. These were carefully lifted and examined for possible evidence of stoloniferous origin, without success. No “runners” or “root-shoots” were discernable. In one instance, a small seedling bore a prostrate branch of second year growth, which had rooted freely at the nodes. This was an instance, doubtless, of natural “layering,” which suggests an alternative method of reproduction, although nothing of the sort was found to occur on the mature shrubs. Representative specimens of these seedlings have been deposited in the Gray Herbarium.

Although the writer would not presume to assert that propagation by stolons does not occur in this species, he has been unable to find any evidence to this effect in the plants under his observation.—R. J. EATON, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

---

NOTE ON *TRISETUM SPICATUM*.—In a short article on *Aira spicata* L., Mr. K. K. Mackenzie<sup>1</sup> states that *Aira spicata* (*Trisetum spicatum*) is invalidated by *A. spicata* published on the preceding page. One fact should be added to Mr. Mackenzie’s statement. In the “Errata” at the end of the second volume of the *Species Plantarum* Linnaeus changes *Aira* 1. *spicatum* to *indicum*. The first volume of the *Species Plantarum* was published in May, the second in August.<sup>2</sup> According to the American Code (Canon 13) the second *Aira spicata* (*Trisetum*) is a homonym and hence invalid. Some botanists may accept Linnaeus’ own correction as if originally the first *A. spicata* read *A. indica*, in which case the second *A. spicata* is valid. Under the the International Rules (Article 50) the second *Aira spicata* (*Trisetum spicatum*) is valid because the first *A. spicata* is universally regarded as non-valid. Furthermore priority of position for names published on the same date is not recognized by the International Rules and Linnaeus’ correction, even though at a later date, would validate the second *A. spicata*.—A. S. HITCHCOCK, Washington, D. C.

<sup>1</sup> RHODORA 31: 194. 1929.

<sup>2</sup> Richter, Codex Bot. Linn. xxx. 1835; Jackson, Journ. Bot. Brit. & For. 61: 174. 1923.